

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 and 44-57 are pending in the application. Claims 1-26, and 44-57 are rejected.

Claims 27-43 have previously been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Claims 1, and 24-26 are amended above. Support for the above amendments appears throughout the originally filed specification, claims, and drawings.

Applicants, by amending any claims herein, make no admission as to the validity of any rejection made by the Examiner against any claim. Applicants reserve the right to reassert any of the claims canceled or the original claim scope of any claim amended herein, in a continuing application.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments to the claims introduce no new matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §132. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants thank the Examiner and his Supervisor Patent Examiner for their time and consideration during the in-person interview held on February 8, 2012.

I. *Claims 1-4, 7, 24, 25, 48-55, and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Polk (US 3,074,247) as set forth on page 3 of the Official Action.*

Independent claim 1, and all depending claims, have been amended above as discussed during the in-person interview held on February 8, 2012, to overcome the prior art of record as set forth in the Interview Summary dated February 8, 2012, thus obviating a response to this rejection.

II. *Claims 5, 6, 8-23, 26, 44-45, 47, and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polk as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Arav (US 5,873,254) as set forth on page 7 of the Official Action.*

Independent claim 1, and all depending claims, have been amended above as discussed during the in-person interview held on February 8, 2012, to overcome the prior art of record as set forth in the Interview Summary dated February 8, 2012, thus obviating a response to this rejection.

III. *Claim 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polk as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Eck et al. (DE 10056181) as set forth on page 17 of the Official Action.*

Independent claim 1, and all depending claims, have been amended above as discussed during the in-person interview held on February 8, 2012, to overcome the prior art of record as set forth in the Interview Summary dated February 8, 2012, thus obviating a response to this rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

If an extension of time is necessary to prevent abandonment of this application and is not filed herewith, then such extension of time is hereby petitioned for under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a). Any fees required for further extensions of time and any fees for the net addition of claims are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 14-0112. Prompt and favorable consideration of this reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
THE NATH LAW GROUP

/William L. Klima/
Susanne M. Hopkins
Reg. No. 33,247
William L. Klima
Reg. No. 32,422
Customer No. 20529

February 9, 2012
THE NATH LAW GROUP
112 South West Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. No. 703-548-6284